



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/604,157	06/27/2000	Steven M. Bessette	45112-081	5501

7590

06/30/2003

McDermott Will & Emery
600 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

15

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/23/03
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 12, 13 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 1616

Receipt is acknowledged of RCE and pre amendment of 5/23/03 each.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang-4,446,153.

The rejection of record is maintained.

See example 1-4 % Benzyl alcohol in a pesticidally acceptable carrier water-This meets applicants insecticidal composition (p.8, lines 3-8) preferentially @ 1% (see example 8, 1%), no patentable weight given to future intended use as termiticide.

Claim 12 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14-20 of copending Application No. 10/269,870. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compositions are the same, even though for different purposes.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 12 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 5 of copending Application No. 09/505,680. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the rejection of record is maintained.

Art Unit: 1616

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Applicant's arguments filed 5/ 23/ 03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant agrees the importance of selecting; however, what is claimed is a composition, not a method, and how the composition came about, or why, is not given patentable weight. As to assertion of superiority, the only objective evidence presented was in an acetone carrier, actually, a solvent, leaving 100% Benzyl alcohol, which like all other essential oils, killed all 10 termites. However, there's no indication that superiority over, say, Diazinon, fipronil or pyrethroids would be an effective means of killing termites, as is claimed. In fact, there is no indication of how one determines a pesticidally effective amount to apply to a termite locus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil Levy whose telephone number is 308-2412. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday- Friday 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees can be reached on 308-4628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1235 or 872-9307 for final communications.

Levy/tgd
June 11, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Neil S. Levy". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Neil" and last name "Levy" clearly distinguishable.

NEIL S. LEVY
PRIMARY EXAMINER